

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 12 and 30 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 3, 4, 6-11, 14-29, 31, 32, 34 and 35 are withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

I. Election of Species Requirement

In a Restriction/Election of Species Requirement mailed on July 26, 2004, restriction was required between Species I-V. However, the Election of Species Requirement indicated that claims 1, 30 and 33 are generic to all species.

Claims 3, 4 and 6-11 depend from patentable claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claims 3, 4 and 6-11 be rejoined upon allowance of claim 1.

Withdrawn independent claims 14, 24, 31 and 32 recite all features of independent claims 1 and 30 including an additional feature of second sub-field periods having a length more than a sum of first sub-field periods. Claims 15-23, 25-29, 34 and 35 variously depend from claims 14, 24, 31 and 32. Thus, it is respectfully requested that claims 14-29, 31, 32, 34 and 35 be rejoined upon allowance of claims 1 and 30.

II. Drawing Objections

The Office Action objects to the drawings because of informalities. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that waveforms illustrated in Figs. 10, 11, 14, 15 and 25 are indistinguishable from the respective backing subfield/voltage grids. The attached Replacement Drawing Sheets correct Figs. 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 25 and 26 to clearly distinguish the waveforms. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Objection

The Office Action objects to claim 12 because of an informality. Claim 12 is amended to obviate the objection without narrowing the claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

The Office Action rejects claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Claim 30 is amended to obviate the rejection without narrowing the claim. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 30 is definite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 13, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,097,358 to Hirakawa et al. ("Hirakawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Hirakawa does not disclose, teach or suggest a driving method or a device sequentially selecting "in a direction from a first sub-field period and a second sub-field period positioned on a boundary of said plurality of first sub-field periods and said plurality of second sub-field periods towards a first sub-field period and second sub-field period at a position most remote from said boundary," as recited in independent claims 1 and 30. Additionally, Hirakawa does not teach or suggest "each of said plurality of second sub-field periods substantially corresponding to a length of a sum of said plurality of first sub-field periods and any one of the first sub-field periods," as recited in independent claims 1 and 30.

The Office Action asserts that Hirakawa teaches sequentially selecting a plurality of first sub-field periods SF1-SF5 and a plurality of second sub-field periods SF6-SF10 where each of the plurality of the second sub-field periods substantially correspond to a length of sum of the plurality first sub-field periods, in a specified direction. See Fig. 3.

Notwithstanding these assertions, Hirakawa does not disclose, teach or suggest, in either the specification or Fig. 3, sequentially selecting in the specified direction and a relationship between each of the plurality of second sub-field periods and a length of the plurality of first sub-field periods.

Hirakawa teaches, in Fig. 3, a field F including a first sub-field group SFG1 having sub-fields SF1-SF5, a second sub-field group SFG2 having sub-fields SF6-SF10 and a third sub-field group SFG3. See column 7, lines 55-column 8, line 6. Hirakawa also teaches each of the sub-field groups SFG1 to SFG3 having an address preparation period TR for preparing for the addressing. See column 8, line 6. Although the address preparation period TR is positioned on a boundary between different sub-field groups SFG1-SFG3, Hirakawa does not disclose, teach or suggest sequentially selecting in a direction from a first sub-field period and a second sub-field period positioned on the boundary, i.e., the address preparation period TR, of a plurality of first sub-field periods and said plurality of second sub-field periods toward a first sub-field period and a second sub-field period at a position most remote from the boundary.

Further, Hirakawa teaches that a weight of luminance of each of the sub-fields SF6-SF10 of the second sub-field group SFG2 is an integer multiple of the minimum weight "1" and equal to one plus the total sum of the weights smaller than themselves ($1 + (\text{the sum of the weights in the first sub-field group SFG1})$), i.e., $6 = (1 \times 5) + 1$. See Fig. 3 and column 8, lines 8-18. Hirakawa teaches that the term "weights" are luminance weights of the sub-fields, not "lengths" of a period. See column 8, lines 22-26. Thus, although Hirakawa teaches a relationship between the weights of luminance of the sub-fields SF6-SF10 in the second sub-field group SFG2 and the sub-fields SF1-SF5 in the first sub-field group SFG1, Hirakawa does not disclose, teach or suggest a relationship between a period length of the sub-fields

SF6-SF10 in the second sub-field group SFG2 and a period length of the sub-fields SF1-SF5 in the first sub-field group SFG1.

Therefore, claims 1 and 30 are patentable over Hirakawa. Claims 2, 5, 12, 13 and 33 variously depend from claims 1 and 30, and thus also are patentable over Hirakawa for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-35 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,


James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Holly N. Moore
Registration No. 50,212

JAO:HNM/ale

Attachment:

Replacement Drawing Sheets (Figs. 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 25 and 26)

Date: January 31, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets makes changes to Figs. 10, 11, 14, 15 and 25 and replaces the original sheets with Figs. 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 25 and 26.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets